



PATENT
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 066079-5099

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Inventors: Alan John HOPPER et al.)
Application No.: 10/528,582) Group Art Unit: 1792
Filed: October 18, 2005) Examiner: Alanko, A.K.
For: PROCESS AND INK FOR MAKING)
ELECTRONIC DEVICES)

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL FORM

1. Transmitted herewith is a Response to the Restriction Requirement dated October 9, 2007 in the above-referenced application.
2. Additional Documents
3. Extension of Time

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) apply.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Applicant petitions for an extension of time, the fees for which are set out in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a), for the total number of months checked below:

<u>Total Months Requested</u>	<u>Fee for Extension</u>	<u>[Fee for Small Entity]</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> one month	\$ 120.00	\$ 60.00
<input type="checkbox"/> two months	\$ 460.00	\$ 230.00
<input type="checkbox"/> three months	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 525.00
<input type="checkbox"/> four months	\$ 1,640.00	\$ 820.00

Extension of time fee due with this request: \$_____.

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a Petition therefor.

An extension for _____ months has already been secured and the fee paid therefor of \$_____ is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of extension now requested.

3. Constructive Petition

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

4. Fee Calculation (37 C.F.R. § 1.16)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED						
	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid	Present Extra	at Rate of	Total Fees
Total Claims (37 C.F.R. §1.16(c))		minus	20	0	x \$50 each=	+ \$0
Independent Claims (37 C.F.R. §1.16(b))		minus	3	0	x \$210 each=	+ \$0
[] First presentation of Multiple dependent claim(s)					\$370.00	+ \$0
SUB-TOTAL =						\$0
Reduction by 2 for filing by a small entity						- \$0
TOTAL FEE =						\$0

5. Fee Payment

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$ _____ to Deposit Account 50-0310.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including fees due under 37 CFR § 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP



By:

Paul N. Kokulis
Reg. No. 16,773

Dated: November 5, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. **09629**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000



Attorney Docket No. 056258-5099

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of)
Inventors: Alan John HOPPER, et al.)
Appln. No. 10/528,582) Group Art Unit: 1792
Filed: October 18, 2005) Examiner: Alanko, A.K.
Title: PROCESS AND INK FOR MAKING)
ELECTRONIC DEVICES)

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of October 9, 2007, the applicants confirm their election of the claims of Group I, i.e. claims 1-13. It is noted in this regard that this election was earlier made by telephone response on February 27, 2007 in reply to the Examiner's telephone request for election on February 22, 2007.

While electing the Group I claims, the applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement. In particular, the device claims of Group II require the use of the process of the Group I claims. Hence these two Groups of claims can be searched and otherwise examined together. The ink of Group III is also specifically adapted for and useful in the process called for in the Group I claims. The cartridge of the Group IV claim (claim 21) depends from ink claims of Group III and, therefore, should be examinable with the Group I claims for the same reason as the Group III ink claims. The Examiner is accordingly requested to reconsider the restriction requirement, particularly with respect to the proposed separation of the Groups I and II claims.

The Examiner's attention is called to applicants' related commonly owned U.S. Application Nos. 10/528,581, filed October 28, 2005, now allowed, and 10/528,583, filed March 21, 2006. It is noted that Application No. 10/528,581 is a national phase filing based on PCT/GB03/03679, filed August 22, 2003 while Application No. 10/528,583 is a national phase filing based on PCT/GB03/03695, filed August 22, 2003.

Favorable action on this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By 

Paul N. Kokulis
Reg. No. 16773

Date: November 5, 2007

Customer No. 09629
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001
Direct: (202) 739-5455